UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,530	07/10/2006	Shigefumi Wada	05168.0070	5654

22852   7590   02/20/2009
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
PARKER, BRANDON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/560,530	WADA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	BRANDON PARKER	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11/19/2008_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-18_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-18_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges the applicant's submission on 11/19/2008 wherein claims

1, 2, 7, 13-16 have been amended and claim 18 has been added, claim 3 has been

previously canceled and claims 1, 2, 4-18 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Li et al (US Patent No. 6,643,825 hereinafter, "Li") in further view of

Vanechanos et al (US Patent 5,884,309 hereinafter "Vanechanos")

Regarding claim 1, Li discloses storage medium storing a key task processing program

which, when executed by a computer system (Col. 4 lines 14-24) executes key task

processing by using an OS (Col. 3 lines 23-39) and an key task processing database,

characterized in that the key task processing program causes the computer terminal

to(Col. 4 lines 4-13): **accept a connection, via a network (Fig. 1A Drawing), from a**

user terminal; determine whether a display format of the user terminal is

dependent on an operating system (Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19)**;** display a

screen (i.e. show all fields) in window format, **using functionality of the operating**

system (Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19), on a display section of **the** user terminal

(i.e. terminal window format), (Col. 6 lines 28 and 29) **if it is determined that the**

display format is dependent on an operating system (Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines

14-19); and display a screen in web format, **using a web browser**, on the display

section of the user's user terminal **if it is determined that the display format is not**

dependent on an operating system. (Col. 6 lines 2-6, Col. 5 lines 30-32).   Li

does not explicitly show to **convert data into a format compatible with a screen in**

web format based on the determination but does show that reformatted data can be

presented to the end user in a variety of styles by applying respective mappings to the

reformatted data from the host application, such as those written in Extensible

Stylesheet Language (XSL) (i.e. web format).

Vanechanos disclose converting data from the user terminal into a format

compatible with the key task processing database if it is determined that the display

format is not dependent on the operating system "data may need to be reformatted in

order to transfer the data from one **database management program** to another" and "if

a retailer desires to implement a **merchandising system on the web**, the retailer may

need to **convert it's existing customer and product database information** to a

format that is compatible with the **server merchandise software (i.e. on the web)**,

(Col. 3 lines 1-16). Vanechanos discloses the **web server system** generates/includes

HTML documents (Col. 4 lines 17-35). In general it understood that **HTML** (i.e.

documents) **data** is not dependent of the OS of the user terminal, therefore when

converting data from database. **In Par. 0063, applicant's specification** discloses "the

key task processing means is a program (function) for executing key task processing

of a company on a computer terminal (including a server)". However, Vanechanos

discloses a server merchandising software is typically oriented toward a particular

company's database management program, and many companies produce database

application software, but the formats in which the various companies' database

management software stores the data are not compatible, therefore data may need to

be reformatted (Col. 3 lines 1-6). There appears to be no difference between the

"converted customer/product database program information" of Vanechanos and the

applicant's disclosure to "convert data from the user terminal into a format compatible

with the key task processing database" being that Vanechanos disclose presents an

order entry system for the internet.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the converting information as taught by Vanechanos with the reformatted data

of Li to efficiently and effectively determine the format on a computer system.

Regarding claim 2, Li discloses **a storage medium storing** a key task processing

program which, **when executed by a computer system** (Col. 4 lines 14-24) executes a

key task processing by using an OS (Col. 3 lines 23-39) and a key task processing

database, the key task processing program causing the computer terminal to (Col. 4

lines 4-13); **accept a connection, via a network, from a user terminal; determine**

whether a display format of the user terminal is dependent on an operating

system (Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19)**;** display the screen (i.e. show all fields)

in window format, **using functionality of the operating system**, on a display section of

the user terminal (i.e. terminal window format), (Col. 6 lines 28 and 29) **if it is**

determined that the display format is not dependent on an operating system (Col.

1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19); and display the screen in web format using a web

browser on the display section of the user's user terminal **if it is determined that the**

display format is dependent on an operating system (Col. 6 lines 2-6, Col. 5 lines

30-32, Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19); 1`wherein the user terminal (i.e. to

provide terminal emulation), (Col. 1 lines 15-21) ; allocates input assisting functions

preset to a plurality of predetermined keys on a keyboard of the user terminal (i.e.

function key selection list, Col. 6 lines 45 and 46, Col. 4 lines 19-25), displays the

names of the input assisting functions (F1=HELP, F2=CLEAR, F3-EXIT, Fig. 1C

Drawing), and when a detection is made that the predetermined keys are pressed down

or the names of the input assisting functions are selected, executes the input assisting

functions (i.e. function carried out), (Col. Lines 19-25).

Li does not explicitly show to **convert data from the key task processing database**

into a format compatible with a screen in web format based on the determination

but does show that reformatted data can be presented to the end user in a variety of

styles by applying respective mappings to the reformatted data from the host

application, such as those written in Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) (i.e. web

format).

Vanechanos disclose converting data from the user terminal into a format

compatible with the key task processing database if it is determined that the display

format is not dependent on the operating system "data may need to be reformatted in

order to transfer the data from one **database management program** to another" and "if

a retailer desires to implement a **merchandising system on the web**, the retailer may

need to **convert it's existing customer and product database information** to a

format that is compatible with the **server merchandise software (i.e. on the web)**,

(Col. 3 lines 1-16). Vanechanos discloses the **web server system** generates/includes

HTML documents (Col. 4 lines 17-35). In general it understood that **HTML** (i.e.

documents) **data** is not dependent of the OS of the user terminal, therefore when

converting data from database. **In Par. 0063, applicant's specification** discloses "the

key task processing means is a program (function) for executing key task processing

of a company on a computer terminal (including a server)". However, Vanechanos

discloses a server merchandising software is typically oriented toward a particular

company's database management program, and many companies produce database

application software, but the formats in which the various companies' database

management software stores the data are not compatible, therefore data may need to

be reformatted (Col. 3 lines 1-6). There appears to be no difference between the

"converted customer/product database program information" of Vanechanos and the

applicant's disclosure to "convert data from the user terminal into a format compatible

with the key task processing database" being that Vanechanos disclose presents an

order entry system for the internet.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the converting information as taught by Vanechanos with the reformatted data

of Li to efficiently and effectively determine the format on a computer system.

Regarding claim 4, Li discloses the storage medium according to any one of claims 1

to 2, characterized in that the input assisting functions displayed on the screen in

window format or the screen in web format allocate input assisting functions (window

format, Fig. 5 Drawing) related with the screen currently displayed (i.e. reformatted

screen, Col. 13 lines 14-20).

Regarding claim 5, Li discloses the storage medium according to claim 4,

characterized in that the input assisting functions displayed on the screen in window

format or the screen in web format allocate input assisting functions (window format,

Fig. 5 Drawing) related with **a cursor** (i.e. position and length data) on the screen

currently displayed (Col. 12 lines 60-66).

Regarding claim 6, Li discloses a storage medium according to any one of claims 1 to

2, characterized in that the key task processing program includes one or more of a

finance and accounting program, a payroll calculating program, a sales management

program, a purchase control program, a stock control program, a tax declaration

program, a fixed asset control program, a cost management program, a client

management program, a human resource management program, and an electronic

banking program (stock control program, Fig. 1C Drawing) .

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 6 therefore the claim is rejected for at least the

same reason.

Regarding claim 7, Li discloses a key task processing system for transmitting/receiving

data to/from a user terminal of a user via a network, comprising: a key task processing

database that stores data for executing key task processing (Col. 3 lines 33-39,Col. 4

lines 4-24, Fig. 1A Drawing) of a company (Fig. 1C Drawing); a key task processing

means for executing the key task processing by using the data in the key task

processing database, **means for determining whether a display format of a user**

terminal is dependent on an operating system of the user terminal(Col. 1 lines 14-

21, Col. 4 lines 14-19);; a means for **displaying a screen in** window format, **using**

functionality of the operating system, if it is determined that display format is

dependent on an operating system(Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19)**;** and

transmitting or receiving the data via the network to/from the user terminal, the user

terminal accepting input of the key task processing in window format (Col. 6 lines 28

and 29); and a means for **displaying a screen** web format, **using a web browser, if it**

is determined that the display format is not dependent on an operating from a

Mac mast edition Koch (Col. 1 lines 14-21, Col. 4 lines 14-19); and transmitting or

receiving the data via the network to/from the user terminal, the user terminal accepting

input of the key task processing in web format (Col. 6 lines 2-6, Col. 5 lines 30-32);

Li does not explicitly show to a means for **converting data from the key task**

processing database into a format compatible with a screen in web format based

on the determination but does show that reformatted data can be presented to the

end user in a variety of styles by applying respective mappings to the reformatted data

from the host application, such as those written in Extensible Stylesheet Language

(XSL) (i.e. web format).

Vanechanos disclose converting data from the user terminal into a format compatible with the key task processing database if it is determined that the display format is not dependent on the operating system "data may need to be reformatted in order to transfer the data from one **database management program** to another" and "if a retailer desires to implement a **merchandising system on the web**, the retailer may need to **convert it's existing customer and product database information** to a **format that is compatible** with the **server merchandise software (i.e. on the web)**, (Col. 3 lines 1-16). Vanechanos discloses the **web server system** generates/includes **HTML documents** (Col. 4 lines 17-35). In general it understood that **HTML** (i.e. documents) **data** is not dependent of the OS of the user terminal, therefore when converting data from database. **In Par. 0063, applicant's specification** discloses "the **key task processing** means is a program (function) for executing key task processing of a company on a computer terminal (including a server)". However, Vanechanos discloses a server merchandising software is typically oriented toward a particular company's database management program, and many companies produce database application software, but the formats in which the various companies' database management software stores the data are not compatible, therefore data may need to be reformatted (Col. 3 lines 1-6). There appears to be no difference between the "converted customer/product database program information" of Vanechanos and the applicant's disclosure to "convert data from the user terminal into a format compatible with the key task processing database" being that Vanechanos disclose presents an order entry system for the internet.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the converting information as taught by Vanechanos with the reformatted data of Li to efficiently and effectively determine the format on a computer system.

Regarding claim 8, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 7, characterized in that the user terminal which displays a screen of the key task processing in window format comprises: a data converting function which converts the data (i.e. reformatted the key task processing means into a data format processable in window format (Col. 5 lines 24-26); an input assisting function used on a screen on which the data are displayed (F1, Fig. 1C Drawing); and a display function which combines the converted data (Employee/Cust #, Fig. 1C Drawing) with the extracted input assisting function (F1, Fig. 1C Drawing) to thereby display them on the screen in window format (Col. 5 lines 24-26); wherein the means for web format transmits contents of the screen in web format in document format (i.e. ordering application) to the user terminal which accepts the input of the key task processing in web format (i.e. XML), (Fig. 1E Drawing, Col. 5 lines 35-44).

Regarding claim 9, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 7 or 8, characterized in that when the data to be used in the key task processing means are transmitted in web format to the user terminal which accepts the input of the key task processing (430, Fig. 4 Drawing) in web format (XML format, Col. 58-62, Col. 12 lines 39-42), the means for **displaying a screen in** web format extracts the input assisting

function to be used on the screen on which the data are displayed and combines the

extracted input assisting function (i.e. input fields) with the data (i.e. position and length

data) to thereby transmit contents of the screen in web format (XML format, Col. 12

lines 58-62).

Regarding claim 10, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 8,

characterized in that the means for **displaying a screen in** web format comprises (i.e.

XML format, Col. 12 lines 59 and 60): a data converting means which converts the data

in the key task processing means into a data format (i.e. reformatted) processable in

web format (i.e. XML format), (Col. 12 lines 39-52); an input assisting means which

extracts the input assisting functions (i.e. input fields) to be used on the screen on which

the data are displayed (Fig. 4 Drawing,); and a web screen creating means which

combines the data converted by the data converting means (reformatted, Col. 4 lines

55-64) with the extracted input assisting functions (Fig. 1B Drawing) to thereby create

the screen (i.e. host screen) in web format (XML, Col. 4 lines 64 and 65).

Regarding claim 12, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 8,

characterized in that the input assisting function receives pressing-down of the function

key, or receives selection of the name of the input assisting function on the screen using

a pointing device, and executes the related input assisting function at the user terminal

(Col. 14 lines 19-25).

Regarding claim 13, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 7,

characterized in that the key task processing means, when a new table or row is added

(Fig. 1D Drawing), adds any one of predetermined character, number or symbol to a head of the table name or the row name (Position, Fig. 1 Drawing) and stores (i.e. saves) it in the key task processing database (425 Fig. 4 Drawing), and when data of the key task processing database are saved, saves a table or a row predetermined by the key task processing means (save table, Fig. 4 Drawing) and a table or a row having the predetermined character, number or symbol at the head of the table name or the row name (425 Fig. 4 Drawing, Col. 12 lines 49-52). Note: The table saved includes the data at the head (i.e. top row) of the table (Fig. 1D Drawing).

Regarding claim 18, LI discloses a method for executing key task processing by using an OS and a key task processing database (Col. 4 lines 14-24, Col. 3 lines 23-39), the method comprising; accepting a connection, via a network (Fig. 1), from a user terminal, accepting a connection, via a network, from a user terminal (Col. 4 lines 14-26);

Li does not explicitly show converting data from the user terminal into a format compatible with the key task processing database if it is determined that the display format is not dependent on the operating system.but does show that reformatted data can be presented to the end user in a variety of styles by applying respective mappings to the reformatted data from the host application, such as those written in Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) (i.e. web format). Li does not explicitly show determining whether a display format of the user terminal is dependent on an operating system of the user terminal; converting data from the key task processing database into a format compatible with a screen in web format if it is determined that the display format is not dependant on the operating system; displaying the screen in window format, using

functionality of the operating system, on a display section of the user terminal if it is

determined that the display format is dependent on the operating system; displaying the

screen in web format, using a web browser, on the display section of the user terminal if

it is determined that the display format is not dependent on the operating system,

however Li discloser a user wishes to reformat and the user selects desired style from

options presented via GUI (Fig 1B, 105), note the style describes/defines a document

type, a look, and a layout to be applied wherein the document type can be document

type can be, for example, a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) document (Col. 6 lines

2-11).

Vanechanos disclose converting data from the user terminal into a format

compatible with the key task processing database if it is determined that the display

format is not dependent on the operating system "data may need to be reformatted in

order to transfer the data from one **database management program** to another" and "if

a retailer desires to implement a **merchandising system on the web**, the retailer may

need to **convert it's existing customer and product database information** to a

format that is compatible with the **server merchandise software (i.e. on the web)**,

(Col. 3 lines 1-16). Vanechanos discloses the **web server system** generates/includes

HTML documents (Col. 4 lines 17-35). In general it understood that **HTML** (i.e.

documents) **data** is not dependent of the OS of the user terminal, therefore when

converting data from database. **In Par. 0063, applicant's specification** discloses "the

key task processing means is a program (function) for executing key task processing

of a company on a computer terminal (including a server)". However, Vanechanos

discloses a server merchandising software is typically oriented toward a particular

company's database management program, and many companies produce database

application software, but the formats in which the various companies' database

management software stores the data are not compatible, therefore data may need to

be reformatted (Col. 3 lines 1-6). There appears to be no difference between the

"converted customer/product database program information" of Vanechanos and the

applicant's disclosure to "convert data from the user terminal into a format compatible

with the key task processing database" being that Vanechanos disclose presents an

order entry system for the internet.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the converting information as taught by Vanechanos with the reformatted data

of Li to efficiently and effectively determine the format on a computer system.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US

Patent No. 6,643,825 hereinafter, "Li") view of Vanechanos et al (US Patent 5,884,309

hereinafter "Vanechanos") in further view of De Boor et al (US Patent No. 6,470,381

hereinafter, "De Boor").

Regarding claim 11, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 8,

characterized in that the input assisting functions are related with function keys on a

keyboard of the user terminal (Col. 4 lines 14-26). Li nor Vanechanos does not

explicitly show when a cursor position is changed on the screen, the key task

processing system changes a corresponding relationship between the input assisting

functions and the function keys and changes display of the names of the input assisting

functions on the screen according to the change of the corresponding relationship but

does show disclose the the input assisting functions displayed on the screen in window

format or the screen in web format allocate input assisting functions (window format,

Fig. 5 Drawing) related with **a cursor** (i.e. position and length data) on the screen

currently displayed (Col. 12 lines 60-66).

However, De Boor discloses function keys that have variable functionality that

change depending on the particular screen display of the user interface being shown

(Col. 9 lines 14-22).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the variable function keys as taught by De Boor with the input assisting

function of Li to efficiently access functions on a new screen display.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US

Patent No. 6,643,825 hereinafter, "Li") view of Vanechanos et al (US Patent 5,884,309

hereinafter "Vanechanos") in further view of Tanaka et al (US Patent No. 6,247,066

hereinafter, "Tanaka").

Regarding claim 14, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 7,

characterized in that when the key task processing means stores the row newly added

by a user in the key task processing database (more fields, Fig. 4 Drawing). Li nor

Vanechanos do not explicitly show a function which is set by accepting the setting of a

row name, a data type and a data length of the added row as arguments of the function

executes writing/saving processing stores the data of the newly added row in the key

task processing database.

However Tanaka discloses a compound document processing system that adds

a new row the command argument and inserts the name and meaning of the argument

into the added row (Col. 12 lines 1-8). Furthermore Tanaka discloses the row in the

table stores the types and corresponding functions (Col. 6 lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to include the compound document processing system as taught by Tanaka

with the key task processing system of Li to efficiently and effectively improve the

processing of added rows in a program.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US

Patent No. 6,643,825 hereinafter, "Li") view of Vanechanos et al (US Patent 5,884,309

hereinafter "Vanechanos") in further view of Rivette et al (US Patent No. 5,754,840

hereinafter, "Rivette").

Regarding claim 15, Li discloses a key task processing system according to claim 7, characterized in that the user terminal which accepts the input of the key task processing in window format includes a menu but Li and Vanechanos fail to explicitly show an additional menu definition file which defines contents of additional menu items to be displayed on a menu bar provided in a frame of the screen in window format or on a menu area provided in the screen in window format; and an additional menu display/calling execution file which reads a menu title or a menu button, which is added to the menu bar on the display of the menu items in the menu area, and an additional menu group, which is displayed on a drop-down menu or an additional menu list when the menu title or the menu button is selected, from the additional menu definition file, displays them on the menu bar or on the screen in window format, and reads and executes a related execution file, with which the additional menu is related, when the additional menu is selected.

However Rivette discloses an edit drop down menu on a menu bar (Col.10 lines 59-61) and adding a command button or menu command to a menu command button (i.e. addition menu item/menu button) in the word processing window (i.e. screen in window format) and the action is performed (i.e. executes a related execution file, with the addition menu is related when the addition al menu is selected), (Col. 10 lines 62-67, Col. 11 lines 1-5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the additional menu item as taught by Rivette with the key task processing system of Li to efficiently manipulate a word processing document.

Regarding claim 17, discloses the key task processing system according to claim 11, "characterized in that the input assisting functions are related with function keys on a keyboard of the user terminal, and when the screen is changed, the key task processing system changes a corresponding relationship between the input assisting functions and the function keys and changes display of the names of the input assisting functions on the screen according to the change of the corresponding relationship" Note Li discloses the storage medium according to claim 4, characterized in that the input assisting functions displayed on the screen in window format or the screen in web format allocate input assisting functions (window format, Fig. 5 Drawing) related with **a cursor** (i.e. position and length data) on the screen currently displayed (Col. 12 lines 60-66).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues neither Li nor Vanechanos disclose converting data from the user terminal into a format compatible with the key task processing database if it is determined that the display format is not dependent on the operating system.

Applicant disagrees, Vanechanos discloses "*data may need to be reformatted in order to transfer the data from one **database management program** to another*" and "*if a retailer desires to implement a **merchandising system on the web***, the retailer may need to **convert it's existing customer and product database information** to a **format that is compatible** with the **server merchandise software (i.e. on the web)**, (Col. 3 lines 1-16). Vanechanos discloses the **web server system** generates/includes

HTML documents (Col. 4 lines 17-35). In general it understood that **HTML** (i.e.
documents) **data** is not dependent of the OS of the user terminal, therefore when
converting data from database. **In Par. 0063, applicant's specification** discloses "the
key task processing means is *a program (function) for executing key task processing
of a company on a computer terminal (including a server)*". However, Vanechanos
discloses a server merchandising software is typically oriented toward a particular
company's database management program, and many companies produce database
application software, but the formats in which the various companies' database
management software stores the data are not compatible, therefore data may need to
be reformatted (Col. 3 lines 1-6). There appears to be no difference between the
"converted customer/product database program information" of Vanechanos and the
applicant's disclosure to "convert data from the user terminal into a format compatible
with the key task processing database" being that Vanechanos disclose presents an
order entry system for the internet

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 4791561 discloses an interactive construction of means for database
maintenance.

US Patent 5038316 discloses a method for generating user documentation for an
application program by executing commands associated with different aspects of the
application program in response to analysis of the application program.

US Patent 5179700 discloses an user interface customization apparatus.

US Patent 7020839 discloses when a broadcast provider places an instruction in an XML document as delivery contents, since the broadcast provider can designate a screen display format for the audiences, the broadcast provider can centrally control the content of the broadcast service.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON PARKER whose telephone number is (571)270-1302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 730- 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon Parker
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

/Joshua D Campbell/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178